

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,045	04/04/2001	Sean M. Reilly	P24184-A USA	2364
7590 · 10/06/2003			EXAMINER	
Joshua R. Slavitt, Esquire			GITOMER, RALPH J	
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP Aramark Tower			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1101 Market Street			1651	9
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950			DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/826,045

Applicant(s)

-----

Reilly et al.

Examiner

Ralph Gitomer

Art Unit **1651** 



			Ш
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	
	for Reply		
THE	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.		
mailing - If the p - If NO p - Failure - Any re	date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within th	and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  he application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 24, 2	2003	
2a) 🗌	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) X This act	tion is non-final.	
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pa	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is arte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposi	tion of Claims		
4) 💢	Claim(s) 1-18	is/are pending in the application.	
. 4	la) Of the above, claim(s) <u>13-18</u>	is/are withdrawn from consideration.	
5) 🗌	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.	
6) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-12</u>	is/are rejected.	
7) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.	
	Claims		
Applica	ition Papers		
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	•	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	e a) $\square$ accepted or b) $\square$ objected to by the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) $\square$ approved b) $\square$ disapproved by the Examine	∍r.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply	to this Office action.	
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	iner.	
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	·	
13)□	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p	riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) [	☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:	·	
	1.   Certified copies of the priority documents have	ve been received.	
	2.   Certified copies of the priority documents have	ve been received in Application No	
	application from the International Bure		
_	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the		
_	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic		
	The translation of the foreign language provisions Asknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic		
15) Li	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 O.S.C. 33 120 and/or 121.	
Attachm	ent(s) otice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).	
	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
_	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 6	6) Other:	

Serial No. 09/826,045 Art Unit 1651

5

10

15

20

25

Applicant's election without traverse of group I, claims 1-11, in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by each of Nelson and Hansen.

Nelson (5,681,712) entitled \$Surface Colony Counting Device and Method of Use teaches in column 1 lines 40-58, adding water to a thin film culture place with a layer of adhesive coated on the upper surface of the substrate and a growth medium that is cold water soluble. The device is incubated for a period of time and the colonies counted. In column 2 there is a cover sheet. The device allows growth, detection and enumeration of microorganisms. In column 3 there are air permeable materials and an impermeable cover sheet described. In column 8 next to last paragraph, there is a transparent cover sheet to facilitate counting of the colonies. In column 8 last paragraph, the cover sheet permeability is discussed. See the claims.

Art Unit 1651

Hansen (4,565,783) entitled \*Dry Culture Media\* teaches in column 2, a device with a water proof substrate, a layer of adhesive coated on the upper surface of the substrate being non-inhibitory to the growth of microorganisms, and a coating of cold water soluble powder adhered to the adhesive containing a medium. There is a transparent cover sheet. The gel has a Brookfield viscosity of at least 1500 cps. In column 3 lines 52-54, the substrate may be transparent to view bacterial colonies. In column 6 line 30, the cover can be permeable to oxygen. See the claims.

All the presently claimed features are taught by each of the above references for the same function as claimed.

15

10

5

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

20

25

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1

5

10

15

20

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103<sup>©</sup> and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over each of Nelson and Hansen.

See the teachings of Nelson and Hansen above.

The claim differs from each of Nelson and Hansen in that it specifies spreading the liquid with a hand press.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the liquid as described by Nelson and Hansen with a hand press because any known method of applying or spreading liquid would have a high expectation of success. No novelty is seen in employing a hand press in applying the liquid.

5

10

15

20

25

Serial No. 09/826,045 Art Unit 1651 -5-

On page 8 of the present specification, a hand press is described that defines a predetermined area such that the application of the press spreads out the liquid to the predetermined area. On page 14 bridging to page 15, Fig. 11 shows a porous pad is wetted to be placed on the surface. The references of record teach adding an amount of liquid and the methods of doing so are well known in this art. Adding liquid to a predetermined area with a sponge or blotter or other related item is old. No unexpected results or advantage is seen in adding the liquid to any area where the references show the liquid wets the powder in the device. It would appear only the total amount of liquid may be useful to standardize.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Each of the following applies in all occurrences.

In claim 10 **%**capable of is indefinite as to what actually occurs.

The title of the invention is not aptly descriptive in view of the restriction requirement. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following prior art pertinent to applicant's disclosure is made of record and not relied upon:

Adams (6,391,626) teaches a dry culture medium apparatus.

Tabacco (6,498,041) teaches culturing spores.

Wicks (6,090,541) teaches cultures.

Nelson (5,089,413) teaches culture apparatus.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ralph Gitomer whose telephone number is (703) 308-0732. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 8:00 am - 5:00 pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on (703) The fax phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 872-308-4743. 9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235. For 24 hour access to patent application information 7 days per week, or for filing applications electronically, please visit our website at www.uspto.gov and click on the button &Patent Electronic Business Center for more information.

1/ Cectonia

Ralph Gitomer Primary Examiner Group 1651

20

5

10

15